



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/531,102

03/17/2000

Robert Giannini

JARB.004PA

5258

40581

7590

04/11/2011

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1150 NORTHLAND DRIVE, SUITE 100
ST. PAUL, MN 55120

EXAMINER

KARMIS, STEFANOS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3653

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/11/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2
3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte* ROBERT GIANNINI and
9 ROBERT J. CRAWFORD
10

11
12 Appeal 2009-009186
13 Application 09/531,102
14 Technology Center 3600
15

16
17
18 Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, ANTON W. FETTING, and BIBHU R.
19 MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

20 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

21 DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING

STATEMENT OF CASE

This is a decision on rehearing in Appeal No. 2009-00009186. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

Requests for Rehearing are limited to matters misapprehended or overlooked by the Board in rendering the original decision. 37 C.F.R. § 41.52.

ISSUES ON REHEARING

Appellants raise 3 issues in the Request for Rehearing. The first issue relates to whether the panel misconstrued the term “compatible.” The second issue relates to whether the panel erroneously found the rationale for modification of the art to be legally sufficient. The third issue relates to whether the panel introduced a new ground of rejection.

ANALYSIS

As to the issue regarding the term “compatible” as applied to two colors in claims 25 and 26, the panel found the term to be of subjective rather than objective determination similar to the term aesthetically pleasing in *Datamize LLC v Plumtree Software, Inc.* 417 F.3d, 1342, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The Appellants contend such a wide scope is not within the spirit of the invention and is not defined by the claims. Request 4.

We agree the term is not defined anywhere in the claims or Specification, and we find the Specification nowhere circumscribes the spirit of the invention. Hence the necessity of ascertaining what the term meant. The Appellants take issue with the dictionary definitions of the term, but the Appellants used the term and must accept its implications. While it may be that some of the dictionary definitions are inapplicable, clearly the definition

1 of in agreement with as applied to colors, meaning that colors agree with one
2 another, is applicable, and its application is in the eye of the beholder.

3 As to the issue of the combinability of the references, the Appellants
4 argue that the Examiner's rationale of color matching was legally
5 insufficient. Request 5. The Examiner pointed to specific portion of the art
6 by column and line number to support this rationale. The Appellants
7 contend the Examiner's finding is conclusory. The Examiner's reasoned
8 that one of ordinary skill would find it predictable and useful to have a way
9 of minimizing the differences between colors. We fail to see how this is
10 conclusory as the finding sets forth the specific facts for the reasoning, viz.,
11 colors are matched and minimizing color differences in such matching is
12 desirable.

13 The Appellants then appear to turn *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550
14 U.S. 398 (2007) on its head by arguing that a finding of obviousness is the
15 predicate to finding predictability. Request 6. This is incorrect. The reverse
16 is the holding of *KSR*. "The combination of familiar elements according to
17 known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield
18 predictable results." *Id.* 550 U.S. at 416.

19 Next the Appellants invite the panel to declare the obviousness
20 rejections as new grounds. We decline the invitation. The Appellants
21 contend that the panel made a finding of an input that was not introduced
22 into the prosecution record beforehand. Request 7. The panel was
23 responding to the Appellants' argument that the Examiner failed to provide
24 an explanation of how CMY output from one device and input to the next
25 device correspond to the claims in the Examiner's explanation of the
26 reasoning for combining the references. This argument did not contend that

1 one of the limitations was not described. The panel simply found this
2 contention to be irrelevant. The Examiner made no findings as to the
3 specific nature of the signal used as this was unnecessary. It was the
4 Appellants who raised this issue and the panel merely responded to the issue
5 raised by the Appellants. The Board cannot be said to have presented a new
6 ground of rejection simply by elaborating on the examiner's rejection or by
7 using different words. *See In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445-46 (Fed. Cir.
8 1992).

9 CONCLUSION

10 Nothing in Appellants' request have convinced us that we have
11 overlooked or misapprehended the claims and applied art, and failed to
12 recognize a new ground of rejection as argued by Appellants. Accordingly,
13 we leave the Decision in place.

14 DECISION

15 To summarize, our decision is as follows:

- 16 • We have considered the REQUEST FOR REHEARING
- 17 • We DENY the request that we reverse the Examiner as to claims 17-
18 31.

19 REHEARING DENIED

20
21
22
23 MP